

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 163979

62

ORIGIN EB-07

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 DOTE-00 SS-15 CAB-05 CIAE-00

COME-00 DODE-00 INR-07 NSAE-00 FAA-00 NSC-05 H-02

EPA-04 PA-02 USIA-15 PRS-01 /076 R

DRAFTED BY EB/OA/AVP:DBORTMAN:JO

APPROVED BY EB/OA/AVP:DBORTMAN

EUR/NE - ACHILLES (SUBS)

EUR/WE - BEIGEL (SUBS)

DOT - CONSTANTINO (INFO)

D - MS. BUTCHER

S/S - MR. ORTIZ

----- 034708

R 112248Z JUL 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY PARIS

UNCLAS STATE 163979

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: EAIR, UK, FR

SUBJECT: CONCORDE

1. IN THE CONSIDERATION OF THE FY 1977 DOT/FAA APPROPRIATIONS BILL ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JULY 10, REP. YATES OF ILLINOIS PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD HAVE PROHIBITED USE OF THESE FUNDS FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TO SSTs NOT MEETING FAR 36, INTENT OF WHICH WAS TO BAR CONCORDE FROM LANDING IN THE U.S. THE AMENDMENT WAS DEFEATED 196 TO 214. A FACTOR IN THE DEBATE WAS THE FOLLOWING LETTER DATED JULY 9, 1975 FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY.

2 BEGIN TEXT: DEAR MR. SPEAKER:  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 163979

I AM DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT A REPORT THAT DURING HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, AN AMENDMENT WILL BE OFFERED DESIGNED TO PREVENT THE OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC COMMERCIAL

AIRCRAFT IN THE UNITED STATES. TO BAN THE CONCORDE IN THIS MANNER WOULD IN OUR VIEW HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON IMPORTANT INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES. I SUPPORT THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY SECRETARY COLEMAN IN HIS LETTER OF JULY 7 TO CONGRESSMAN MCFALL, A COPY OF WHICH IS ENCLOSED, STATING THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO RUN AND THAT IT WOULD NOT BE IN OUR BEST INTEREST TO SHUT OFF ARBITRARILY FULL CONSIDERATION OF THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE BY THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE DOT APPROPRIATIONS BILL.

THE ALLEGATIONS THAT WE PROMISED THE BRITISH OR FRENCH GOVERNMENTS THAT THE CONCORDE WOULD BE ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES ARE NOT CORRECT. THEY UNDERSTAND THAT THE CONCORDE MUST MEET U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND CONCORDE IS NOW INVOLVED IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONALLY-MANDATED STANDARDS OF THE NOISE CONTROL ACT OF 1972 AND THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969 TO DETERMINE WHETHER CONCORDE MEETS THESE U.S. REQUIREMENTS.

HOWEVER, THE BRITISH AND FRENCH GOVERNMENTS HAVE ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS EXPRESSED TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT THEIR CONCERN ABOUT POSSIBLE DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT OF THE CONCORDE. WE HAVE ASSURED THEM AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS THAT THE CONCORDE WOULD BE TREATED FAIRLY IN ALL ASPECTS OF U.S. GOVERNMENT REGULATION. FOR THE CONGRESS TO SUSPEND EXISTING PROCEDURES EVEN NOW IN PROGRESS WITHOUT AN ADMINISTRATIVE, JUDICIAL, OR CONGRESSIONAL HEARING AND TO BAN THE CONCORDE SUMMARILY WOULD CERTAINLY PROVOKE CLAIMS ON THE PART OF THE BRITISH AND FRENCH GOVERNMENTS THAT THE CONCORDE, A PROJECT IN WHICH THEY HAVE INVESTED NEARLY 3 BILLION DOLLARS AND WHICH IS OF ENORMOUS SIGNIFICANCE TO THEM, WAS BEING EXCLUDED DISCRIMINATORILY

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 163979

AND CONTRARY TO U.S. TREATY AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS. ON THE FACE OF IT, THE THRUST OF THE REPORTED AMENDMENT WOULD APPEAR TO BE DISCRIMINATORY SINCE IT DENIES CONCORDE THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES REFERRED TO IN SECRETARY COLEMAN'S LETTER.

A BAN ON CONCORDE OPERATIONS, WITHOUT DUE EXAMINATION AND CONSIDERATION, COULD ALSO DO DAMAGE TO THE UNITED STATES IMAGE AS A SUPPORTER OF A MORE LIBERAL INTERNATIONAL TRADE REGIME. THIS IN TURN COULD EFFECT AMERICAN AEROSPACE EXPORTS WHICH FOR THE LAST TWO DECADES HAVE REPRESENTED THE LARGEST MANUFACTURED COMPONENT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE. FROM TIME TO TIME, PROTECTIONIST MOVES HAVE BEEN PROPOSED IN BRITAIN

AND FRANCE TO KEEP AMERICAN AIRCRAFT OUT SO THAT  
BRITISH AND FRENCH AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES COULD BE MAINTAINED  
THE CONTINUED SUPPORT OF FREE TRADE ELEMENTS IN THESE  
COUNTRIES WOULD BE THREATENED SHOULD THE UNITED STATES  
DENY THE CONCORDE ACCESS ON A NON-DISCRIMINATORY BASIS.

I HOPE THAT FOR THE REASONS STATED ABOVE THE PROPOSED  
AMENDMENT WILL NOT BE ADOPTED.

SINCERELY,

ROBERT S. INGERSOLL  
ACTING SECRETARY   END TEXT.  
AN IDENTICAL LETTER WAS SENT TO MINORITY LEADER,  
REP RHODES;

3. A LETTER OPPOSING THE AMENDMENT WAS ALSO SENT  
BY THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION. COPY BEING POUCHED.

4. WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE  
PLANS HEARINGS JULY 24 TO CONSIDER WHAT USG COMMITMENTS  
HAVE BEEN MADE IN RESPECT TO ENTRY OF CONCORDE  
ANOTHER HEARING ON CONCORDE IS EXPECTED IN SEPTEMBER,  
THIS TIME BY THE AVIATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE  
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE. INGERSOLL

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 26 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** LAW, FUND ALLOTMENT, CENTRAL LEGISLATURE, AVIATION REGULATIONS, CONCORDE, AMENDMENTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 11 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** n/a  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** n/a  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:**  
**Disposition Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE163979  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** EB/OA/AVP:DBORTMAN:JO  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** D750242-0159  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197507105/baaaapax.tel  
**Line Count:** 137  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN EB  
**Original Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** ShawDG  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 13 JAN 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <13 JAN 2003 by ThomasVJ>; APPROVED <15 MAR 2004 by ShawDG>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** n/a  
**TAGS:** EAIR, UK, FR  
**To:** LONDON  
PARIS  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006